A Modeſt
ENQUIRY
Into the
Weight of *Theodore Eccleſton's*
REPLY
TO
A Serious EXPOSTULATION *with the*
QUAKERS.

In a
SECOND LETTER
To a Pariſhioner of
Pont y pool, Monmouthſhire.

By the AUTHOR of the former.

Dan. 5. 27. *TEKEL.*

Matth. 6. 23. *If the Light within you be Darkneſs, how great is that Darkneſs!*

LONDON Printed: And Sold by *Sam. Rogers* in *Ivy-Lane*. 1709.

A Modeſt ENQUIRY

Into the Weight of *Theod. Eccleſton's* REPLY, &c.

NEIGHBOUR!

AT length the ſo long threaten'd *Anſwer* to my EXPOSTULATION is arriv'd; and you muſt not wonder, that the ſame tender Regard for your Welfare, which engag'd me at firſt in this Debate, does now alſo move me to lay before you the diſingenuous Arguings, Miſconſtructions, and other unavailing Subtilties of your Boaſted Champion.

It has been frequently remarked of ſome Modern *Anſwers*, That the ſame Authors they pretend to examin, drew 'em up themſelves. This Thought, I muſt own, came into my Head, upon reading the *Reply*; and it was no ſmall Pleaſure to me, that the Author had affix'd his Name; leſt the malicious World ſhould have charg'd me with that Artifice; for (to do my Friend *Eccleſton* Right) he could not have oppos'd my Suggeſtions with leſs of Reaſon or Authority, nor laid his Cauſe more open to a plain, and (were I ſo enclin'd) ſevere Recrimination, tho' he had ſubmitted the whole Per-

formance to my Inſpection and Amendment.

And, having taken care to obviate this Imputation, I ſhall, with more Chearfulneſs, proceed to ſet before you the Truth of his Aſſertions, and the Force of his Reaſonings; and that (I hope) will move you duly to conſider, how vainly they employ themſelves, who would ſet up the Idol of their own miſguided Fancy, in Competition with that clear and intelligible Manifeſtation of God's Will, which he has revealed and eſtabliſh'd in the Holy Scriptures.

As to the Preface, which the Author (like moſt of the Atteſtators) takes by Hear-ſay, my Confirmation of the Truths by me laid down, will be found in an authentick *Poſtſcript* hereunto annex'd; only one thing I cannot help taking Notice of here, which is Friend *Theodore*'s Aſſertion, (*a*) That *the Quakers of this Generation were allow'd to be Orthodox, by no ſmall Member of the Church of* England: I own, I never ſaw *Prieſt Archer*'s *Book*, nor am I ſollicitous whether I ever do; but if he admits a *Rejection of the Holy Sacraments*, of *Apoſtolical Ordination*, of a *Chriſt* that has *Fleſh* and *Bones*, and other *Quaker* Tenets, to be *Orthodox*, I will heartily agree with the *Replicator*, that he is *no ſmall Member*, nor yet *any Member at all of our Church*; tho', from the Specimen of Sincerity your Author has given in the Book before me, I am more enclinable to believe, that he has put Concluſions into Mr. *Archer*'s Mouth, which the good Man never intended.

(*a*) Preface, *p.* 11.

To begin then: Your Author tells me, (*b*) That *if my Enquiry after Truth be ſincere,*

(*b*) Rep. *p.* 1.

he

he hopes the following Lines will afford me Matter of Information. This, I heartily confeſs, is true; but muſt likewiſe (and with Concern I do it) add, That he only *informs* me to how wretched a Slavery that Creature is given up, who, having his firſt Principles tainted with Miſtake, does continually labour to ſupport one Fallacy by another.

Of this Truth I ſhall ſoon give you undeniable Demonſtration: And, by the way, tho' that, conſidering thoſe that follow, is a puny Errour, be pleas'd to note his Remark, (*c*) That *Men, who give a merely literal Interpretation of the Scripture, cannot give a true one:* As if that glorious Rule of Action, to which all Mankind are to referr, were ſo blindly or uncertainly laid down, as never to be underſtood as 'tis expreſs'd. This gives you ſome Taſte of the Man's Judgment; a little forward, obſerve his Honeſty and Candour, where (*d*) he charges me with Prevaricating, or *forſaking the Promiſe I had made*; "*That I wou'd be careful to impute* "*nothing to you, but what the Conſent of your* "*Party left unqueſtionable, or what ſome of your* "*moſt eminent Writers have aſſerted.* If I have gone off from this Rule, his Rebuke is juſt: But if indeed I have prov'd my Aſſertions from *Robert Barclay*, who inſinuates, (*e*) *That God has not committed his Will now wholly to Writing; nor that the former Ways of God's Revealing his Will by immediate Revelation, are now ceas'd.* If, from *Chriſtopher Atkinſon* (*f*), who very ſcurrilouſly *denies that Chriſt was God and Man in one Perſon:* From *W. Smith* (*g*), who ſays, *they are falſe Teachers, that preach a Chriſt in Heaven:* And from Mr. *Penn* through-

(*c*) P. 2.

(*d*) P. 4.

(*e*) Catech. P. 154.

(*f*) Exp. P. 31.

(*g*) Ibid.

throughout the Book; and theſe too, in a way ſo manifeſt, as he has not thought fit to gain-ſay; then by common Rules of Juſtice, I am to return the *Prevaricator* to his Door, tho' I have thought of a Method which might reſtore me to his Favour, namely, by quoting him upon the next Occaſion among the *eminent Quaker-Advocates.*

However, to produce ſomething like an Evidence of what he ſays, I am referr'd *(h)* to another Piece of *R. Barclay*, wherein he very frankly *concedes to the Scriptures, the ſecond place in his Eſteem*, and in the Cloſe, comes up to St. *Paul*'s Affirmation, that *they will throughly furniſh the Man of God to every good Work*, by which, if he intends to prove, that the *Quakers* do not conſiſt with *one another*, nor yet with *themſelves*, there is ſo much Truth and Reaſon on his ſide, that I cannot in any Modeſty diſpute it.

(h) P. 4.

I ſhall therefore paſs on to his next Animadverſion; and here (Neighbour) you muſt not think me tedious in giving this Affair a very particular Examination, becauſe your Author in this place, has very ſlyly laid a fallacious Ground-work, upon which the greateſt part of his miſ-call'd Reply is built. You may obſerve (if you have not already) that in the fourth Page of my Expoſtulation, I quote Mr. *Penn* for the following Definition of the *Light* to which thoſe of your Party pretend: *(viz.)* " *That it is not natural* " *Conſcience, or the Law of God in the Heart of* " *Man; neither is it Conſcience illuminated by* " *Preaching of the Goſpel, and Operation of the* " *Holy Ghoſt thereon:* [thus far negatively

" *By*

"*But it is that very Principle of Life and Light,*
"*which was the Spring and Force of the Apoſto-*
"*lical Miniſtry; It is the* WORD-GOD
"*himſelf within you, and* differs *from* Divine
"Grace, *as the* Workman *differs from the*
"Work, *and of which it were no Deluſion at*
"*all to affirm, that it is equal, or even ſu-*
"*perior to the Scripture.*

Now, pray Neighbour, compare this with your *Author*'s Quotation, and I doubt not, but you will readily perceive what a *ſhuffling Adverſary* I have to deal with; for I am ſure, every impartial honeſt Judge of this Debate, muſt needs confeſs, that it lay upon *Theod. Eccleſton*, either to diſown my Quotation, (which he has not done) or elſe to prove the *neceſſary Exiſtence* of a *ſaving Principle* in Man, contradiſtinguiſh'd to the *Law of God in the Heart*, to *Conſcience illuminated by the Preaching of the Goſpel, and Operation of the Holy Ghoſt*, and to *Divine Grace*: If he has done this, his Labour may be call'd a Reply, if not, he muſt not take it amiſs that I call it an Evaſion: And to convince you that it is ſo, do but look into what he calls my *State of the Caſe (i)* where you may find, that he has dropt the whole *negative*, and five Lines of the *poſitive Definition* (nine out of eleven) and with them the Queſtion propounded: and accordingly you ſee him proceeding (*k*) to *ſhew the Exiſtence of a Principle, call'd Light or Grace*, &c.

(*i*) P. 5.

(*k*) P. 7, 8.

No, no, (Friend *Eccleſton*) that will not avail thee, for *W. Penn* has already disjoin'd thoſe *Principles*, and declar'd *Light* (yours I mean) and *Grace* to be things of a quite different Nature; which I am ſatisfied you were

were perfectly aware of, when you ſlipt that Branch of the Declaration, and turn'd off to the Aſſertion of an obvious Truth, which the *Church of England* has always as earneſtly maintain'd, as any Aſſembly of Chriſtians upon the face of the Earth; and therefore it was no wonder, you ſhould produce the Teſtimony of ſome of her *Biſhops* to vouch for what they all agree in: But it was a wonder (and a ſore one too) that a Man ſhould be ſo abandon'd to Blindneſs and Prejudice (that I ſay no worſe on't) as to charge me over and over with *diſowning a Principle*, that I made it my Buſineſs, thro' the whole Courſe of my Book, to explain and confirm; my Objections all along being manifeſtly laid againſt the *unintelligible Nature and Meaſure* of Mr. *Penn*'s *Light*, between which, and the *Illumination of Grace* here mention'd, he has ſet ſo remarkable a *Difference*. This, therefore, was the *New Doctrine* for which I requir'd the *Teſtimony of Miracles*; and any one who had not made it his Buſineſs to miſtake me, would without difficulty have own'd it.

By this time *(Neighbour)* I ſuppoſe you ſee the Unfairneſs of your *Author*'s Management, and as you attend him thro' the greateſt part of his Book, you will find that his Poſitions (ſo far as they concern the *Light*) do all turn upon this Hinge of Fallacy: So that, in anſwer to all he has ſuggeſted, I am only (which is done already) to ſet the Queſtion in a fair and honeſt View; whence it will appear, that your Friend has been *muddling* himſelf (to uſe his own Word)

and

and ranſacking Authorities to prove what no body, unleſs Mr. *Penn*, denies.

However, I ſhall not paſs over his Arguments (frivolous as they are) without ſome occaſional Notes, as I go along. And firſt, (*l*) where he ſpeaks to the *Miniſters of Religion*, and after this manner argues (or rather quibbles) upon them——— *Either their Sending is Man's Sending or the Lord's Sending; if only of Man, their Condition is miſerable; if of the Lord, how proveſt thou that, but only by Man's Sending; and that's no Proof at all?* Here, I ſuppoſe, your *Author* thinks he has me at a ſtrong Dilemma; but if he had not a very peculiar Ill-turn in his Underſtanding, he might perceive a poſſibility of our being *ſent by God and Man*; (i. e.) *by Men commiſſion'd from God to ſend us*: The *Nature* and *Authority* of this *Commiſſion* he may read in Dr. *Potter's Diſcourſe of Church-Government*, or rather in the *Holy Scripture* it ſelf; to whoſe *Rule of Ordination*, our *Church* is moſt exactly conformable; for let not your *Author deceive* himſelf nor you, into an Imagination, that we *diſclaim*, or do not *rely* on the *Aid* and *Concurrence* of the Holy Ghoſt, in the *Entrance* and *Courſe* of our *Miniſtry*; which we inſtantly pray for and expect, and, I hope, have ſome reaſon to acknowledge; and if, when the *Common-Prayer-Book* was in his Hand, he had look'd on to the *Office of Ordination*, as well as *Baptiſm*, he would have known that we place the Efficacy of one and t'other in the *Concurrence of the Holy Spirit*; Not that we have the Folly to expect, or Confidence to affirm, that our *Commiſſion* proceeds from an inſtant *audible Appointment*

(*l*) P. 10.

of God; nor does your *Author*, (I preſume) great as his Modeſty is! ſet up by an *Authority* ſo particular. But it were an endleſs Toil to follow him through all his giddy Suppoſitions: I therefore haſten to another Page (*m*), where you will meet with a ſlanting Inſinuation, as if the *Church of England* did maintain, *that Men ſtood in no need of overcoming their evil Inclinations, but might* ſafe enough *continue miſerable Sinners from* 16 *to* 60 *Years of Age.* 'Tis well for the *Church of England* that her Doctrines are not to appear in this *Author*'s Repreſentation alone, and that his invidious Colouring cannot make the *Spouſe of Chriſt* be taken for the *Whore of Babylon*: Let her *Ordinances* ſpeak (more truly) her Opinion in this Matter, eſpecially the *Service* for *Aſh-Wedneſday*, where the Inquiſitive may find, that a moſt terrible Denunciation of God's ſevere Judgments, is all the *Encouragement* we give to *perſevering* and *impenitent Sinners*: If thoſe are Tokens of *Safety* and *Approbation*, then your *Author*'s Reflection is well grounded; if otherwiſe, how ſhall I return his *railing Accuſation*, unleſs by ſaying (like *Michael* to the *Father of Lyes*) *The Lord rebuke him!*

(*m*) P. 14.

If the *Replicator* is ſtill offended, in that we own our ſelves to be *unprofitable Servants*, and beg continual Pardons of God for the *Sins of Ignorance* and *Frailty* that many times *ſurprize us*; he muſt know, that we cannot help believing it a moſt provoking *Inſolence*, that Man (who is *ſhapen in iniquity*) ſhou'd think he can be able to *abide the Extremity of God's marking what he does amiſs*; and it confirms us not a little in this Belief, when we conſider,

conſider, that the Great Judge of all our Actions has already aſſign'd the Preference to the *humble Publican that confeſs'd his Weakneſs*, rather than to the *audacious Phariſee that boaſted his Perfection.*

Before I leave this Page, excuſe a ſhort Remark upon the Foundation whereon your *Author* ſeems to build your Claim to *Perfection*, namely, being actuated by that Spirit *that never err'd*; if this be your Condition, happy are ye: But that ſome of you fall from it, both in Doctrine and Practice, I need go no further than the *Replicator*'s Book to prove; let the Marginal Note upon *Phil. Maſhman* (of which more by and by) atteſt the one, and your Author's *blame* of *Chriſtopher Atkinſon*'s (*n*) *Expreſſions* the other. (*n*) P. 47.

The next Obſervation worthy of Notice, is (*o*) where, having quoted *Ant. Sadeel*, and referr'd to *Du Pleſſis*, *Donnerus*, &c. he concludes, that, *in requiring the Teſtimony of Miracles, I am upon the Papiſt's Argument againſt the Proteſtant.* Perhaps I am, but certainly with much more Reaſon on my Side, in expecting a *miraculous Proof of Illuminations above the Scripture, and diſtinct from the Operations of the Holy Ghoſt*, than the *Papiſts* had, to demand ſuch Evidence of Men who only aſſerted the *Authority of Scripture and ordinary Grace*, againſt the groundleſs and tyrannical Uſurpations of ſome vain Pretenders to *Infallibility.* (*o*) P. 19.

What next occurrs (*p*) is his *Reply* to my *Examination* of the *Texts of Scripture* urg'd in your Defence, and firſt that of *Joel* 2. 28. where (according to his wonted Sincerity) (*p*) P. 20.

he wou'd have me underſtood as *reſtraining all the Emanations of the Spirit to the Time of the great Pentecoſt*; whereas, in truth, I intended nothing leſs: And any unprejudic'd Reader (ſuch, *Neighbour*, I hope to find you) will eaſily acknowledge, that I wou'd limit only ſo much of it as does tranſcend the *Ordinary Diſpenſation*, particularly that of *Womens Prophecying* or *Preaching*, in which, I think, the Apoſtle *Paul* (*q*) is on my Side: However, on the *Replicator* goes, and muſters up abundance of Authorities, (amongſt the reſt, the eminent Lord Chief-Juſtice *Hales*) to prove, (*r*) That "*an Efflux of the Divine* "*Influence, proportionably communicated to thoſe* "*Faculties of the Human Soul, the Underſtand-*"*ing and the Will, is the true Light which* "*lighteth every Man that cometh into the World.* Hereupon, I would only ask the *Replicator*, Whether the *Law of God in the Heart of Man, and Conſcience illuminated by the Preaching of the Goſpel, and Operation of the Holy Ghoſt thereon, and Divine Grace* (all which Mr. *Penn* diſclaims in his Definition) are not Expreſſions, at leaſt, tantamount to Sir *Matthew*'s *Efflux of the Divine Influence upon the Underſtanding and the Will*? If they are, (and ſure your Friend *Eccleſton* will not have the Forehead to deny it) then, by his very own Courſe of Reaſoning, the *Light to which thoſe of your Party pretend*, is not *the true Light which lighteth every Man that cometh into the World.*

(*q*) 1 Tim. 2. 12.

(*r*) P. 23, 24.

Thus (*Neighbour*) you ſee how little Cauſe your *Author* had to triumph in the *Biſhops, Foreign Proteſtants, Chief-Juſtice*, and other Authorities he produces, inaſmuch as they

they only vouch for a *Principle* diſown'd by Mr. *Penn*, (whoſe Cudgels he has taken up) and how untruly he ſuggeſts my *Unhappineſs in taking up a Religion, without underſtanding the Difference between that Miraculous Power that was in the Apoſtles*, (I am glad to find he allows a *Difference*, for then your *Illumination* does not come up to the *very Force of the Apoſtolical Miniſtry*) *and thoſe Degrees of the ſame Spirit whereby others were enlightned alſo*: Whereas my whole Endeavour has been, to aſſert and preſerve the Diſtinction, which your *Authors* have as earneſtly labour'd to confound.

Let us try however if he has any better Luck in his next Animadverſion upon that Text, 1 *Joh.* 3. 24. (*ſ*) *Hereby know we that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.* Which I underſtand thus — *That a Spirit* [or Temper] *obſervant of the Commands of God, and affectionate towards Men, was the trueſt Indication of God's Abiding with us.* This, being exactly agreeable to St. *John*'s own Comment in the following *Verſes*, did, to me, appear the *moſt natural Meaning of the Words*; however, it ſeems otherwiſe to the *Replicator*, who, in the next Line, enquires Magiſterially, *how ſhall we know that we live in God, and God in us?* This, I muſt confeſs, would have given me ſome Surprize, had not one of the *Friends* told a *Neighbour* of mine, ſome Days ago, that *Theodore was a* GREAT WIT; and ſuch (they ſay) have *ſhort Memories.*

(*ſ*) P. 26.

In the next Leaf (*t*) he proceeds to conſider another Text, 1 *Joh.* 2. 20. *Ye have an Unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things;*

(*t*) P. 27.

things; and here, in token of Good-breeding, he beſpeaks my *Patience* while the Matter is in iſſue, and very roundly charges me with *endeavouring to prove, that the People of God to whom* John *wrote, had not the Unction, tho', he ſaid, they had it.* Inſtead of which, I only urg'd the *Difference in Meaſure between the Unction of the Apoſtles, and that of the Saints at large,* (the ſame *Difference* he, before, calls me *unhappy* in not regarding) which later I repreſent as conſiſting in a *through Conviction of the Truths of the Goſpel*: And in this Expoſition, tho' your *Author* does not, the *Apoſtle* plainly agrees with me, as you may read in the very *next Verſe*, where he appeals to them, as knowing that the Doctrines he taught, were no Lye, but the Truth. However, Friend *Theodore* goes on to multiply Abſurdities, and, repeating an Obſervation of mine, (*u*) "That, *if the* "*Knowledge of God's Will were to be ſtill im-* "*mediately communicated to Mankind, there* "*wou'd be room to enquire to what End was there* "*any Scripture at all?* This (he ſays) I my ſelf *have Anſwer'd, by Expounding* Ver. 26. *thus*— "*Theſe things have I written unto you,* "*concerning* [*or to arm you againſt*] *thoſe that would ſeduce you.* I know not how things may appear to Mr. *Eccleſton's enlightned Underſtanding*; but, to me, the *Concluſion* lies *quite* on t'other Side, and the *Apoſtle's* very earneſt Direction, that they would be *arm'd by his Writings* againſt thoſe that might *ſeduce them*, does unavoidably imply the *Neceſſity* of ſuch *Exhortations* as would *not be wanted*, if the *Unction* had *taught* them perfectly all their *Duty*; whereas I only think (as above) it referr'd

(*u*) *P.* 28.

referr'd 'em to the *Holy Scriptures*, as what they knew, by Virtue of their *Unction*, to be Truth. And by this time, I dare say, the Reader is convinc'd, that it was not without a Cause the *Replicator* bespoke my *Patience*.

But I am not like to 'scape so; for he has found, (*w*) that, after citing another Text of *Scripture* urg'd in your Behalf, I bring some dangerous *Greek* and *Latin to alter the Meaning of the Phrase*. Alas for the poor Man! Does not he know, he that quotes *Greek* so liberally himself, that I only produce the Words in their Original and Genuine Language; which, I believe, he is the first Man alive that ever stumbl'd at, as an *Alteration* not to be admitted. Yet, because he does not seem to hold his Answer full, without an equal Mixture of Indiscretion and Falshood, I am here again impeach'd as *opposing the Gift of the Spirit*: Tho', in the Page under his Examination, I, more than once, express the *enlightning of their Understanding*, as done by the *Divine Assistance of God's Grace, and Operation of the Holy Ghost*. And this, could you believe it! the Man himself, in the very same Leaf, yea, within five Lines of this unworthy Imputation, does at length acknowledge, and thereby most obviously discover, that Sincerity, and Honest Dealing, are, in his Opinion, no necessary Materials in a Dispute about *Religion*.

(*w*) *P.* 29.

That this Remark upon him may not want a further Confirmation, in the next Page (*x*) he quotes me for declaring, that "*I would not have a New Way of being taught* "*the Will of Heaven* —— Which is true: But

(*x*) *P.* 30.

But to this he ſubjoins, *Yet art thou not willing we ſhould ask for the* Old Paths, *where the* GOOD *Way is, and walk therein, as commanded,* Jer. 5. 16. And here again (to ſhew his *Wit*) he is pleas'd to *forget* all Obligations of Truth and Fairneſs, as any Man muſt acknowledge who looks into my *Expoſtulation,* (p. 33, 34.) and there obſerves, that I not only *allow,* but even *conjure,* with the utmoſt *Vehemence,* all of his Perſwaſion, to ſeek after the Lord in the Ways he has preſcrib'd, and to *ask* (as the Prophet ſpeaks, *Jer.* 5. 16.) *for the* OLD PATHS, *where the* GOOD WAY *is, and walk therein.* This is ſo groſs an Impoſition upon his Reader, that, if the Man had not the moſt contemptible Opinion of ſuch as differ from his Way, he could never imagin they would paſs it over unobſerv'd, or not make uſe of it, among other Arguments, to prove, that the *Spirit* he contends for, had no Share in Dictating theſe Repreſentations; for that *God* is not as the *Replicator,* that he ſhould *lye.*

But, to proceed, I had ſaid, " *If Scripture-*
" *Knowledge be* ONLY *acquir'd by Inſpiration,*
" *then all Human Aids, for the attainment of it, are needleſs,* &c. And hereupon he arraigns
(y) P. 32. me (y) as *not diſtinguiſhing between the divers Gifts of the ſame Spirit, which,* a little forward, he ſays, *looks as if I had never read the Parable of the Talents:* But I am ſure, by this and ſuch-like Inſinuations, it ſeems much more probable, that he *has never read my Book* which he takes upon him to anſwer; for if he had, he muſt of neceſſity know that our Conteſt in that Place was not about the

General

General Gifts of the Spirit, but about that very *Particular Gift*, whereby (ONLY) Men were to underſtand the *Will of God in Scripture*. I deſire *Friend Eccleſton* to look again upon that Place; and then, if he has not the *Forehead deſcrib'd by the Prophet* (z), he will modeſtly take back the *Blunder* to himſelf.

(z) Jer. 3. 3.

Well— But I have offer'd another Motive to our Relyance on the Sufficiency of *Holy Scripture*, which (he ſays) I am *fond of*, namely, from the *Parable of Abraham and the Rich-man*, where I am blam'd *for turning Men back to* Moſes *and the Prophets, which were to bid 'em be circumciſed, and become Debtors to the whole Law*. I find *Theodore* has no mind to loſe his *Fore-skin*: But (*Neighbour*) I cannot conceive ſo meanly of your Underſtanding, as not to think you, at one View, perceive your *Champion*'s Weakneſs in this Point; and are ready, with me, to enquire, Where lies the neceſſity, that any one, who recurs to *Moſes* for the *Hiſtory of the Creation*, or any *Precept* of the [everlaſting] *Moral Law*, muſt alſo be *circumciſed, and obedient to the whole Jewiſh Polity*? This, I am ſure, you will own to be a very *unnatural Deduction*, tho' your *Author* ſeems to adhere to it in Practice, as well as Opinion; which, perhaps, may be the Reaſon why he makes ſo little Conſcience of bearing falſe Witneſs againſt his Neighbour; which (without running the Riſque of *Circumciſion*) he may find forbidden in the 20*th Chap. of the* 2*d Book of Moſes, called Exodus, at the* 16*th Verſe*: And, for my own part, I am ſtill of the ſame Opinion, that if a *Jew* was to take the Bulk

of his Religious Information from *Moſes and the Prophets*, (i. e.) *from Scripture*; the Obligation is good *à fortiori* upon a *Chriſtian*, who has the glorious Addition of the *Goſpel, to enlighten and direct him*; and to this I do the rather give in, (being truly *fond*, as your *Author*, by way of Reproach, deſcribes me, of every Tenet that has the *fair Authority of Scripture to ſupport it*) becauſe I have now before me that remarkable *Text* in the *Author to the Hebrews* (*a*), who, ſpeaking of this very *Moſes*, and *part of his Law to the Jews*, ſays, *Unto us* [Chriſtians] *was that Goſpel preach'd, as well as unto them.*

(*a*) C. 4. v. 2.

I come now to that Part of your *Author*'s Book, wherein he undertakes to *anſwer my Examination of your Rule of Action and Belief, the Light within you, as it occurs in ſeveral Differences between you and moſt of the Chriſtian World.* (*b*) To which he compendiouſly *Replies*, (like the Confuter of *Bellarmin*, but with far leſs Truth) that *all theſe*, O extenſive Charity! *are in the Apoſtacy.* However, he does not diſdain to beſtow a ſort of Animadverſion upon the Particulars, in which let us attend him. As to the *Difference* about the *Miniſtry*, he refers me to *Page* 10. where I have already ſpoken to it, and agreed with him, that a *Concurrence of the Holy Ghoſt* (if he means no more) *is neceſſary to a true Goſpel Miniſter*; tho' I cannot come up to his other Aſſertion, unleſs he can find out a Way (as he elſewhere adviſes me) to *blot ſome Truths out of the Bible* that determin otherwiſe.

(*b*) P. 35.

What next he ſpeaks to, is *Water-Baptiſm*, (*c*) the *neceſſity* of which I had aſſerted from

(*c*) P. 36.

that

that Expreſſion of *Chriſt to Nicodemus* (*d*) *except a Man* [τις, any one] *be born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* In anſwer to this, he refers me to a *great Oppoſer of the Romiſh Church, Dr. Fulk:* I have not (indeed) the *Doctor*'s Book by me, and therefore take his Quotation upon his Word, which, by the way, I would have him own to be a Favour; but however, I cannot fall in with the Opinion (be it whoſe it will) that *material* viſible *Water* is not there to be underſtood; for tho' *Water* is ſometimes put to repreſent the *purifying Operations of the Holy Spirit*; yet, to be *born of Water* is a Phraſe never ſo taken in *Holy Scripture*; nor can it, I preſume, in common Senſe, be here ſo us'd, becauſe the *Operation of the Holy Spirit* is *ſeverally* mention'd; ſo that, by your *Author*'s Rule, our *Saviour* is ſuppos'd to ſay, *Except a Man be born of the Spirit and of the Spirit, he cannot enter,* &c. which would not be agreeable to that Character of Wiſdom which was ſo juſtly given to all he ſaid. Yet that I may not ſeem to ſlight any of thoſe notable *Reaſonings* the *Replicator* is ſo fond of, and, likewiſe, to be even with him for his *Proteſtant Doctor*, I would wiſh him to conſult another very worthy *Doctor*, as little a Friend to *Popery* as the former; (*e*) who in his Comment upon the Place, is pleas'd to underſtand it according to the *Letter*, and produces that very Parallel of *Baptiſm by Fire*, which was *viſibly* perform'd at the *Great Pentecoſt*, as a Reaſon why we ſhould ſo take it: And I would fain ask my Friend *Theodor*, if the *Baptiſm* of *Water* muſt only be conſtrued his way, how it

(*d*) John 3. 5.

(*e*) Dr. Whitby.

came to paſs that St. *Peter*, unleſs he alſo was in the *Apoſtacy*, did command the *Baptiſm* of *Cornelius and his Company*, even after the *Holy Ghoſt* had actually *fallen upon them*?

(*f*) P. 37. In the next Page (*f*) your Author is offended that I call *Water* a *Sign* of the Effuſion of the *Holy Ghoſt*, and makes himſelf very aukwardly merry with Quibbling upon the Word: *Tell us* (quoth he) *is it a true or a falſe, a certain or uncertain Sign*, &c. Good *Neighbour*, if ever you pray in aid of *Theodor*'s Wit again, referr him to the Great Book of the Signifing of Names bequeath'd in the beginning of *Geo. Fox*'s Will; there, perhaps, he may learn the Difference between a *Sign* or *Symbol*, and a *Sign* or *Effect*, and I would adviſe him alſo to ſome other of your Books (if I knew which) where he might learn more Honeſty than to accuſe us as adhering to the *outward Sign*, excluſive of the *inward inviſible Grace*, or, as he ſoon after (*wittily*) does, of "*ſaying with the Rhemiſt* "*againſt the Proteſtant, that Water is a Party or* "*Co-worker with the Spirit in Regeneration*: But this he ſays without conſidering the woful Conſequence; for had we ſo held, we could not have call'd it a *Sign*, and then (*friend Theodor*) thou hadſt loſt; conſider it Man! thou hadſt entirely loſt the ingenious Interrogatories above-recited.

(*g*) P. 37. Take one further Obſervation, and I have done with this Article: Your *Author* (*g*) quotes me for this Saying, "*that Water-Bap-* "*tiſm* [the *Baptiſm* enjoin'd by *Chriſt*, and practis'd by his *Apoſtles*] "*is diſus'd by you, to* "*countenance your pretended ſinleſs Perfection*; and adds, "*that I do ill to reflect upon Perfe-*

"*ction*

"ction (if this be reflecting) *for that our Saviour* (I ſhould ſay *Chriſt*, for the other does not ſeem to be *Theodor*'s Term) *exhorts Men to be perfect as our Father which is in Heaven is perfect*: Which (as he ſeems to apprehend it) does imply, that *Men may be as perfect as God himſelf*; whereas there is no occaſion for the reſtraining the Words to ſuch an *inacceſſible* Degree of general *Perfection*; for that the Context, and parallel Words in the other Evangeliſt, do manifeſtly point out the Virtues of *Charity* and *Beneficence* as the immediate *Patterns* in which we are to *imitate God*; not but that it is own'd our Duty (if that will content the *Replicator*) to draw as near as we can to the *General Perfections* of our Maker, tho' we muſt not think we can ever come up to the *great Original*. As to his Suppoſition (*h*) that *I put down the following Doctrine as one of Yours, and hold the contrary my ſelf*, he *ſuppoſes* (if that were any Novelty) quite otherwiſe than is true; for all the Inference I draw from that ſtate of the Caſe, is only this, that *eſteeming your ſelves void of Sin, you do not hold Baptiſm, which implys Pollution, neceſſary*. (*h*) P. 38.

He comes next to ſhoot his Bolts againſt the *Lord's Supper*, which he ſeems unwilling (*i*) I ſhould call a *Goſpel Inſtitution*; for (ſays he) *if thou meaneſt Chriſt's laſt Supper, that was the Paſſeover appointed in the Days of* Moſes: Now what but a judicial Infatuation, could prompt a Man to ſtumble thus upon Carpet-ground? We read in the Inſtitution of the *Paſſeover*, (*k*) that it was to be *a Lamb of the firſt Year*, which they were to eat with *Bitter Herbs*, &c. But in our *Inſtitution*, which (*i*) P. 39. (*k*) Exod. 12.

the

the *Apoſtle Paul* delivers, *as he receiv'd it from the Lord himſelf,* (*l*) it is ſaid, that *Jeſus, the ſame Night that he was betray'd, took Bread,* &c. *likewiſe after Supper, he took the Cup, and gave it to them, ſaying, This is the* (not old but) *New Teſtament in my Blood: this do in remembrance of me.* So that, you ſee, when your Friend is once heated in Controverſy, he leaps over all Encloſures, and neither the difference between a *Lamb* and a piece of *Bread,* no, nor yet our *Lord*'s own Affirmation, that it was an *Inſtitution* of the *New Teſtament,* can with-hold him from aſſerting, that the *Supper* we receive is the ſame with the *Jewiſh Paſſeover.*

(*l*) 1 Cor. 11. 23, 24, &c.

Having affirm'd the neceſſary Continuance of this *Inſtitution,* I went on to offer ſome of the Ends and Purpoſes of celebrating it, in proof of the Doctrine laid down: Theſe the *Replicator* calls (*m*) *Devices of mine,* the firſt of which was, *a thankful Remembrance of the Sacrifice of Chriſt's Death, and the Benefits we receive thereby:* But with what Aſſurance he could charge me with *deviſing* this, which is the expreſs Inducement alledged by our *Bleſſed Lord himſelf,* I leave you (*Neighbour*) ſeriouſly to conſider; and ſhall proceed, tho' I do it with Regret, to lay before you one of the moſt Impious Notions, that, for ought I know, ever iſſued from the Mouth of a pretended *Chriſtian.*

(*m*) P. 40.

I preſume it is a Maxim which you all agree in, that the *WORD-GOD,* to uſe Mr. *Penn*'s Phraſe, *abideth or dwelleth among you.* Now, your *Author* directly, and without all reſerve, affirms (*n*) that if *He,* (the WORD-GOD) *comes to dwell among Men,*

(*n*) P. 40.

Men, they will then neither want the Benefits of his Sufferings, *nor any Remembrance of it.* Pray *Neighbour* weigh ſoberly the Import of this Poſition; (I beg you to do it, as you regard your eternal Welfare) and reflect upthe Event of your Adherence to your *Author*'s Doctrine in this point. If you retain any Expectation of Advantage from the *Death* of your *Redeemer*, then by this Rule, the *Light or WORD-GOD is not among you:* If, on the other hand, you ſtick to your *old Tenet*, and ſay *he is*, then your *Author* has concluded for you, that *you need not the Benefit of his Sufferings*; tho' beſides the Teſtimony of the moſt upright Men in *Scripture*, who all hoped for Salvation under this Claim, and expected *by his Stripes (o) to be healed*, the very Sufferings themſelves are an invincible Reproof to that Opinion; for ſurely, God would not have ſent his only Son, to *take our Nature upon him, and ſuffer Death upon the Croſs, for our Redemption*, if that Miracle of Mercy could, with a due Regard to his other Attributes, have been accompliſh'd without it. But I hope, *Neighbour*, your *Author* ſpeaks but his own Opinion, not yours, in this Particular; for indeed, it is a Tenet that will leave but too little room for thoſe charitable Thoughts, which I am willing to entertain concerning you.

(o) Iſaiah 53. 5.

He brings ſome further Objections *(p)* againſt my Reaſons alledg'd for the continual Obſervance of this Sacrament, ſome of which I therefore take Notice of, leſt he ſhould imagine from my Silence, they carried any weight; tho' others among them deſerve only *Lactantius*'s Confutation of a Loud

(p) P. 41.

Loud Laughter: Of this latter ſort is his learned Remark upon our *Supper before Dinner*, which the poor Man is ſo tickled with, that he repeats it agen in the next Line, not conſidering, or (to the reproach of his *Infallibility*) not underſtanding, that * κοινὴ, *cœna*, does in no ſort imply the Time, but the Society † (κοινωνίαν) of eating: Ay, but he would know of me, *What the Paſſeover was a Memorial of? Whether of another ſucceeding Memorial?* In plain Engliſh, Whether to day may be a *Memorial* of, or comes after to morrow? Sure this fell under his Hands at an ill time of the Moon, he could never elſe have mov'd ſo abſurd a Queſtion, when I had juſt given him the Anſwer to it in his own Words; and if he cannot diſcern how the *Deliverance* of the *Children of Men* from *Death eternal*, was typified in the *Deliverance* of the *Children of Iſrael* from a *temporal Death* at that time, I muſt own I pity his Intellectuals, but cannot approve of their Judgment, who made choice of him for an *Advocate* againſt our *Church*, who does not yot know, that it is never our Uſage *to leave any of the Bread and Wine that is ſet apart for the Communion, till another time.*

* *Scil.* δεῖς, *i. e.* Communis vitus.

† 1 Cor. 10. 16.

In my third Reaſon (or *Device* as he calls it) for the Continuance of this *Holy Inſtitution*, I had urg'd its being a *Badg of Unity*, or *Communion between the Members of Chriſt's Church*; and this I affirm'd and prov'd to have been St. *Paul*'s Opinion of it: But what is *Paul*, that he ſhould oppoſe the *Replicator*? *Paul* was a Man that own'd himſelf *Chief of Sinners* (*q*), and *glory'd in the Croſs of Chriſt* (*r*), which *Theodor Eccleſton, perfect*

(*q*) 1 Tim. 1. 15.

(*r*) Gal. 6. 14.

as God is perfect, has no need of. However, let us look into the Force of his Argument, *Is there not* (ſays he) *vaſt Contrariety* (ſ) *between the Profeſſors of this Memorial, even to the Breach of Unity?* And pray, *Neighbour*, may not you or I as well enquire, is there not as great *Contrariety* between the *Profeſſors* of *Chriſtianity* at large? And ſhall we thence conclude, that to promote *Unity* and *Brotherly Love* was not the Deſign of that Heavenly Diſpenſation? So little is the Importance of what he offers here; and when afterwards he objects againſt it, becauſe not mentioned at the *Council holden* (*Acts* 15.), might he not with equal Juſtice have argued againſt every other Duty not there enjoin'd, and ſo gone on to aſſert that a *Chriſtian* was obliged to nothing more than *Abſtinence from Blood*, &c. Whereas the *Apoſtles* only drew up an occaſional Determination upon the Points that were then in debate before them. (ſ) P. 42.

What next demands our Attention, is his Remark upon the *Reſurrection*; where he ſeems very unwilling to admit that the *ſame Humane Body* (t) *ſhall riſe again*, and moreover, appears greatly offended that I ſhould call Chriſt's *Reſurrection-Body* a *Carnal Body*, which Word he inſultingly repeats above 20 times in the ſpace of two Leaves: Let me therefore, before I go any farther, endeavour to ſet him right in that matter; and, with the leave of his *Infallibility*, lay before him the ground of his Miſtake. The Word *Carnal* metaphorically us'd, has (indeed) always a reprovable Meaning, as to be *carnally-minded*, &c. and under this Notion the *Replicator* ſeems to underſtand me in the (t) P. 44, 45.

place above-mentioned, which I am perſuaded no body but the *Replicator* would have done, when I had juſt given him our *Saviour*'s Words, importing that his *Body was* [not a *Spiritual Body* in your *Author*'s Senſe, but] a *Body* of *Fleſh* and *Bones*; now the Book of the ſignifying of Names will inform him that *Caro* ſignifies *Fleſh*, and *Carnalis Fleſhly*; and if he allows me that, then the Word I have been ſo faulty in making uſe of, will be reſolv'd into our Redeemer's own Expreſſion (*u*); to whoſe Authority in this, and all other matters, I muſt ever *concede* a more than *ſecondary Deference*.

(*u*) Luke 24. 29.

Well, but *Dr. Burnet in his Sermon before the King, aſſures us, that we ſhall ariſe above the Depreſſions of Senſe, and ſhall drop our vile Bodies*, &c. (*x*). Now if I can prevail with the *Replicator* to take a ſecond View of my *Expoſtulation*, he will find that (in page 29) I have very roundly ſubſcrib'd to what the Biſhop here affirms: So that all we are to learn from this Paſſage, is only that your *Author* reads now and then ſome of our *Biſhops Sermons*. I wiſh he read them oftener, and to better purpoſe! A little forward, he urges me to *conſider that Chriſt oppoſeth the Notion of a Carnal Reſurrection, ſaying* (*y*) *when they ſhall riſe from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the Angels which are in Heaven.* Good *Friend Theodor*, whatever thou doſt by me, endeavour not profanely to ſet the *Son of God* at variance with himſelf: I have already referr'd you to the place where he calls his *Body* a *Body of Fleſh*, and ſo far is he from contradicting that Aſſertion here, that he rather appears to confirm

(*x*) *P.* 45.

(*y*) Mat. 22. 30.

firm it, as will be ſhewn by conſidering the occaſion of theſe Words, which was that the Sadduces, (*who ſaid there was no Reſurrection*) thought *wittily* to expoſe that Doctrine by propounding a very knotty Queſtion, as they believ'd, about *ſeven Brethren who had married the ſame Woman, whoſe Wife ſhe ſhould be in the Reſurrection?* In anſwer to this, our Saviour does not repreſent them as guilty of any Error in ſuppoſing they ſhould *riſe* with *human Bodies*, but only reproves their idle Fancy concerning *Marriages in another Life*, implying that as the *Angels did not marry*, ſo *neither ſhould they*; and the Reaſon is plain, for that having dropt their *Frailties*, and put on *Immortality*, there would be no occaſion for that natural Method of encreaſing whereof *Marriage* was a Means. And had *Chriſt* intended their likeneſs to *Angels* in the *Nature* and *Subſtance* of their *Bodies*, he would in all probability have determin'd thus —— *For in the Reſurrection they neither marry, nor have humane Bodies* (as your Queſtion ſuppoſes) *but are as the Angels.* So that by this time, I hope (Neighbour) you perceive the Reaſon why I do not, as your *Author* adviſes, *take my Pen and blot the Word Carnal out of my Book*; yet to go as far as may be towards his Satisfaction, I ſhall let him know the true and only Motive to my uſe of the Word *Carnal* (for I am not fond of hard Words) rather than *Fleſhly*; and he may find it in (*page* 44 of) *Mr. Penn's Defence of Goſpel Truths*, the Book then under my Conſideration; ſo that my Adherence to that Word afterwards, was only to avoid the Imputation the *Replicator* too juſtly deſerves,

of ſhifting unfairly from the Terms in debate.

(z) P. 46. In the next Paragraph (z) he urges me to *conſider if there be no Diſparity between Chriſt's Sinleſs Body, and Man's Sinful Body:* If by *Diſparity* he means whether one was more a *Body of Fleſh* than the other? (which is the Queſtion before us) I anſwer, No; As to his Objection about the *difficulty of reſtoring Bodies corrupted*, I am afraid it will entitle him to the Reproof of St. *Paul*, which Mr. *Penn* was ſo (ſeemingly) cautious to avoid, (a) for none, but one of *David*'s Men, who *ſaid in their Hearts there was no God* (b) would bewray ſuch a Diffidence of his Power, as to doubt whether he could as well *reſtore* the ſcattered Atoms to their former Diſpoſition, as at firſt create them out of nothing. And then, for the other *Difficulty, about decrepit Bodies, which ariſes from his cloſing to the Point*, (if I may perſuade the *Wit* to reſume his Memory) he will find that already ſolv'd by one of his own Vouchers, the *Biſhop of Sarum*, where he ſays *we ſhall drop our Infirmities*, &c. I ſhall not reſt upon his ſuppos'd Oppoſition between the Terms *Carnal* and *Glorious*, becauſe I believe all the World (beſides himſelf) will allow, that they may be, and are, both apply'd to one *Body*. But I cannot part with this Leaf (c) till I have taken a ſhort notice, how artfully he cloſes (without ſeeming to do it) with his Friend *Chr. Atkinſon*, in diſowning the Exiſtence of *Chriſt's* even glorious Body in Heaven, by expreſſing his Senſe of that matter in Terms that were indiſtinctly apply'd to the *Son of God*, long before his Aſſumption of the *Humane*

(a) Def. p. 44.

(b) Pſalm 14. 1.

(c) P. 47.

mane Nature. And for his *ſecond Thoughts*, wherein he deſires me to *agree with him, that God is no limited Being*, he cannot ſurely be Maſter of ſo little Senſe or Honeſty, (tho' I will make him great abatement on that Head) as either to believe or ſuggeſt, that I, or any other Man, profeſſing Chriſtianity, would diſſent from that Opinion. I appeal to his own *Conſcience* to determine, whether he could ever think, that by teaching Men to *believe the Humane Nature of Chriſt was exalted into Heaven*, we intended to *circumſcribe* his *Godhead* there? And if his *Conſcience* does not condemn him for the Unworthineſs of ſo groundleſs an Inſinuation, I ſhall have too much Cauſe to believe (with (*d*) St. *Paul*) concerning it, that it is *ſear'd with a hot Iron.* (*d*) 1 Tim. 4. 2.

And now (*Neighbour*) I am drawing to an end of his Remarks upon this Debate; and ſince he ſeems unwilling (*e*) to allow *holy Job*'s Authority from the Force of his *Marginal Reading* and Cobweb-Diſtinction between *Seeing* and *Beholding*; neither of which have any appearance of Weight in 'em. I will furniſh him with an Authority or two more from our *Saviour Chriſt* himſelf; one, (*f*) where he adviſes, *not to fear them which kill the Body, but are not able to kill the Soul; but rather to fear him which is able to deſtroy both Soul and* BODY *in Hell:* Thereby plainly noting, That the *Body*, which will be in *Hell*, is the ſame with that which might have been *kill'd.* The other is, that (*g*) about *plucking out and cutting off the offending Eye and Hand; for that it is profitable that one Member ſhould periſh, and not that the whole Body* (*e*) P. 48. (*f*) Mat. 10. 28. (*g*) Mat. 5. 29, 30.

ſhould

ſhould be caſt into Hell: From whence we muſt needs gather, that the *Reſurrection-Body* ſhall be numerically the *ſame*, as conſiſting of all the *ſame Limbs* or *Parts*. And, now I am fallen into this Text, I would leave it upon him with Advice, That if he cannot reſtrain his *Hand* from Writing longer againſt the Truth, he would even take our Bleſſed Saviour's good Direction, and *cut* the perverſe *Offender off*.

(*h*) P. 49. As to his Admonition, (*h*) *That I would make it my Care to get a Part in the Reſurrection to Eternal Glory*; I do ſincerely thank him for it, and as heartily return the good Advice; and muſt deſire him (as a Means thereunto) to weigh ſeriouſly this Counterpart to his Summary of the Diſpute between us, by the Truth of which I had ſaid, *the Authority of your whole Illumination falls.* I. That, *the Scriptures are able to make Men wiſe unto Salvation*, 2 Tim. 3. 15. II. That, *except a Man be born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*, Joh. 3. 5. III. That, *unleſs ye eat the* [myſtical] *Fleſh of Chriſt, and drink his Blood, ye have no life in ye*, Joh. 6. 53. and that, in ſo doing, *you muſt continue a Remembrance of his Death until he comes* to judge the World, 1 Cor. 11. 26. IV. That, *Chriſt's Reſurrection-Body was* (indeed) *a Body of Fleſh and Bones*, Luke 24. 29. and that, *our Reſurrection-Body ſhall be faſhion'd like unto his*, Phil. 3. 21. V. That, *they deceive themſelves, who ſay they have no ſin*, 1 Joh. 1. 8, 9. And, VI. That, *the ſame Jeſus, whoſe Reſurrection-Body was taken up into Heaven, ſhall ſo come again in like (viſible) manner as the Diſciples did ſee him go into Heaven*,

Acts

Acts 1. 11. If all, or even but one of theſe Truths, confirm'd by the unerring Spirit of God in Scripture, are yet deny'd (as I have prov'd) by the Writers of your Party, and particularly by the *Replicator*, then is my Aſſertion good; and, in this manifeſt Repugnance of your Private Spirit to the Written Word of God, it does appear, that your pretended Illumination is no other than a *ſtrong Deluſion*; from which, I beſeech the Father of Mercies to give you ſafe Deliverance! and find my ſelf ſtrongly mov'd to glorifie his wiſe Providence, who has not left himſelf without ſuch an infallible Witneſs as will for ever try and diſcover the Impoſture of all thoſe who pretend to bring Meſſages in his Name, when *he has not ſent them*.

I would gladly here releaſe you (*Neighbour*) and be at Eaſe my ſelf, but that a further Specimen of your *Author*'s ingenious Liberty demands my Attention. You will find that he ſays, (*i*) *Denying the Power of Godlineſs, being a lifeleſs Miniſtry, Hirelings and Hypocrites,* (for that was next in the *&c.*) *is own'd by us to be our very State.* I ſuppoſe, the ſame Author that allow'd *Quakeriſm Orthodox*, did likewiſe oblige the *Replicator* with this Conceſſion; if not, it was certainly inſpired by the *old Accuſer of the Brethren.* I don't know to what Purpoſe Dr. *Gell*'s Criticiſm (*k*) upon ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσταυρωμένῳ (if the *Replicator* underſtood the *Croſs of Chriſt* as well as St. *Paul*, he would have writ ἐσταυρωμένῳ) is produc'd by your Author, unleſs he would therefrom infer, that *Jeſus* was not *crucified* among the *Jews*; and if that be what he drives

(*i*) P. 50.

(*k*) P. 52.

drives at, it muſt not be taken amiſs, that I cannot fall in with his Interpretation.

His laſt Eſſay is upon my *Poſtſcript*; and (*l*) P. 54. here (*l*) he cannot allow my Conſequence, *That ſuch as are abundantly ſatisfied in their Inducements to change from one Religion to another, muſt be able to expreſs them* to the Satisfaction of their Oppoſers. In Proof of which, he puts the following Queſtion — *Was there not an honeſt and zealous Martyr that ſaid, I cannot diſpute for Chriſt, but I can die for him.* Such a Perſon, as he ſpeaks of, I acknowledge, and am well pleas'd to find him own the *Zeal* and *Honeſty* of one, in that *Miniſtery*, which he, juſt before, undiſtinguiſhingly brands as *mercenary* and *hypocritical*. But let me tell you (*Neighbour*) that the Story, however true, is in no meaſure pertinent to what your *Author* is upon; for tho' the good *Biſhop* did, by reaſon of his great Age, refuſe to enter the Liſts of Controverſy, againſt a Set of Men that were deeply read in *Fallacy* and *Shuffling*, yet he did not decline giving them a very Manly and Rational Account of the Opinions he adher'd to; which, having prevail'd upon him, at the full Strength of his Reaſon, he would (now 80 Years had paſs'd him) rather die, than ſubmit to any further Debate. This, if your *Author* reads Dr. *Burnet*'s *Hiſt. of Reform.* as well as his *Sermons*, he may know to be true of Biſhop *Latimer*; and if it proves any Thing in the Caſe before us, the Teſtimony, you muſt grant, is on my Side, who affirm'd, *That no Man could receive a Conviction, he was not able to account for.* Which this *good Prelate*, under all the Diſadvantages

of

of Age and Infirmity, did gloriously perform.

(*m*) Where I preſs Men *to lay ſoberly to heart the true State of the Difference between us*; his Anſwer is, to *hope they do ſo, tho' they cannot declare their Sentiments in this Matter.* And to this he adds a very extraordinary Reaſon *(from a Wit)* why we ſhould *confeſs the Reality of their Convictions*; namely, *becauſe*, in leaving us, *they forſake a faſhionable Church that has Preferments within its Pale.* This (*Neighbour*) you muſt confeſs to have been very notably urg'd in Behalf of thoſe Men *who want Words to expreſs their own Meaning*, becauſe ſuch muſt needs be in great danger of being tempted with *faſhionable Preferment.* However, as a further Token of his Unhappineſs in putting Caſes, he enquires *whether, if God ſhould give me Repentance, for any known Tranſgreſſion of my Duty* (ſuch as Men may be Judges of) *I would not willingly have all Men think me ſincere in the Change?* And cannot the *Replicator* ſee a Difference between forſaking a *known Tranſgreſſion*, Drunkenneſs for Inſtance, where the Action ſpeaks it ſelf, and Men have hardly any room to doubt the *Truth* of the *Change*; and the Adherence to, or Deſertion of a Speculative Duty, where the Competition may perhaps ſeem to be precarious? If he is ignorant of this Diſtinction, he is ignorant indeed; and, if he truly underſtands it, he muſt know, it was little to his Purpoſe.

(*m*) P. 55.

To the Enquiry in his laſt Paragraph, I have this to anſwer, That I daily pray for thoſe *Aids of Divine Grace* he ſpeaks of, and, to my very great Comfort, do often find them.

I have now done with your Author and his Arguments, and ſhall add only a few Words to the *Writer* of the *Poſtſcript*, who ſeems rather to give the Hiſtory of his own *Change*, than to argue upon the Caſe. I muſt confeſs, I wiſh you had made uſe of his Pen in the whole Debate, as one from whom I might have look'd for better Reaſonings, and ſhould, at leaſt, have been ſure of a candid and ſincere Examination; for, however we happen at this time to differ in Opinion, I never was, nor ſhall be backward in declaring my Belief, That my *old Acquaintance, E. Jevans*, is a very honeſt Man; and ſince it is not poſſible, but the Deluſion, I take him to be in, muſt be ſomewhere chargeable; I do freely aſſure him, That I impute it wholly to his Judgment. And hereupon, I muſt tell my *Friend*, That his Advice, *Not to let the Religion of Mens Education be that of their Judgment*, is a little too generally laid, and may ſeem to barr even thoſe who are *educated* in the *Religion* he now profeſſes, from perſevering in it: But, not to reſt upon that, I would only, with much Earneſtneſs, enquire of him, Whether he thinks the Aſſiſtances of *God's Grace*, which he now declares ſo warm a Senſe of, would be diſcontinued, ſhould he again return to that Communion, wherein he receiv'd his *Education*? If he thinks they would, let me further enquire, What he takes to be the Obſtacle, in our Church, that can hinder him from *turning his Mind inward to the Divine Gift*, (I hope he means *the Law of God in the Heart*) as freely as he now does? If he ſhall ſuggeſt, as ſome of your

your Writers have done, That the External Services we enjoin, are any Lett to his Contemplations of this Kind; he muſt know, that theſe, if they were not (as they are) agreeable to the Word of God, and Uſages of Primitive Chriſtianity, as well as ſubſervient to *Decency* and *Order*, would yet be no manner of Obſtruction to his Private Devotions, wherein all Men are free from any Appearance of Reſtraint.

I muſt needs own, I am at a loſs to know the Reaſon why he could not preſerve that Peace of Mind he ſpeaks of, in as full a meaſure under our Diſpenſation as any other, unleſs he did happen to place (which has been ſaid of ſome) ſo great a Confidence in the Externals of Religion, as to neglect the *Operations of Divine Grace*; and that could bring no Reflection upon our Doctrines, which give not the leaſt Encouragement to ſuch a Practice. Tho' (indeed) even by my Friend's own Conceſſion, in this Place, he does not ſeem to account for leaving the *Church of England* in ſo clear a manner as might be wiſh'd; becauſe, he ſays, this novel Application did only *reſtore him to the Regularity he enjoy'd before*: Which ſhews, that the *Peace of Mind* he now feels, was alike attainable in our Way.

How little agreeable the Principles of your Party are to the Scriptures of Truth, I have in ſome meaſure ſhewn in the foregoing Papers, which I beſeech my Friend to read over with the ſame Coolneſs and Attention with which he read *Robert Barclay's Apology*. However, I ſhall not paſs over the Scriptures he produces, without

the Conſideration due to them and him. The firſt is, (*Joh.* 4. 23, 24.) *The true Worſhippers,* [*i. e.* the *Jews,* diſtinguiſh'd (*v.* 22.) from the *Samaritans* who are ſaid to *worſhip they knew not what,*] *ſhall worſhip God in ſpirit and in truth.* Now I appeal ſeriouſly to the Conſcience of my Friend, whether this Text may not fairly be underſtood thus —— The true Worſhippers ſhall worſhip the Father [not with carnal Sacrifices as they now do, but] *in ſpirit*-[ual Sacrifices, *acceptable to God through Jeſus Chriſt,* 1 Pet. 2. 5.] *and* [not in the *Types* and *Shadows* of the *Law,* as the *Jews* now do, but] *in* (the) *truth* [*of the Goſpel,* Joh. 1. 17.] for (*v.* 24.) *God is a Spirit,* and *they that worſhip him* (aright) *muſt do it in ſpirit and in truth, i. e.* agreeably to his ſpiritual Nature, by offering up their Hearts and Spirits to him, and according to his *Will,* by ſerving Him as the Precepts of the Goſpel have enjoin'd. This, I hope, my Friend will admit to be a juſt Acceptation of the Words; and if he does, I am ſure there will be little room to ſay, that the Worſhip of our Church is not as conformable (at leaſt) to this Injunction as any Sett of Chriſtians in the World, inaſmuch as we place the Efficacy of all our Services in the Zeal and devout Elation of Mind that ſhould go along with them, and in our exact Obſervance of the *Goſpel Inſtitution* and *Apoſtolical Uſages* about the manner of performing them. So that this Text is only of Force againſt thoſe wretched People (if ſuch there be) who think it enough to *draw nigh to God with their Lips, when their Hearts are far from him*; or eſteem them-

themſelves ſafe, in the *Rejection* or *Diſuſe* of thoſe *Ordinances* which he has requir'd ſhould *for ever* attend his Worſhip.

As to the other Quotation (*Rom.* 8.) where *the ſpirit* is ſaid to *help our infirmities*, &c. I am ſure my Friend cannot charge the Neglect of it upon the *Church* wherein he had his *Education*, which, he knows, does perpetually acknowledge the Inability of Men even to *ask aright for the things they would receive*, and therefore does inceſſantly admoniſh and enjoin that we call for the *Aids* of *God's Grace, mercifully to aſſiſt our Prayers.* His Reference to the *Pſalms*, I have likewiſe conſider'd, and (except the word *Light*, Pſal. 27. 1.) I cannot find any thing that may be (even miſ)taken, to diſtinguiſh you from us; unleſs he ſhould apply to us, King *David's* Character of the Wicked, which I hope better of his *Chriſtian Latitude* than to believe.

The Words of the Prophet (*Lam.* 3. 25,26.) muſt alſo be underſtood to import, that Perſons who feel the Weight of God's Viſitation, as they did whom the Prophet there bewails, will do well to bear it with Temper and Reſignation, and *wait quietly* (*i. e.*) without Impatience for the Time when he ſhall think fit to withdraw the Calamity, and *viſit 'em with Salvation.* Thoſe other Places of St. *Paul* (Eph. 6. 18.) and St. *Jude* (20, &c.) of *Praying in the Spirit*, have, in their Parallels, been accounted for already, and cannot be held to mean any thing elſe, than the *Concurrence, Operation*, or *Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt*, which it is very ſtrictly the Doctrine of the *Church of England* to aſſert and recommend.

As

As to *begrudging* my Friend any Inſtance of God's *Mercy*, I hope he believes better of me than to think I do it; or that I would upon any Account contend for a Compliance with the *Miniſtry* in which it has pleas'd God to place me, but from an entire conſcientious Perſwaſion that it is moſt exactly agreeable to that Primitive Inſtitution *which the Son of God came down from Heaven to eſtabliſh*. If any have objected againſt his Change of Opinion, as proceeding from *Diſtreſs of Circumſtance*, or other *Secular Corruption*; I pray God forgive them! for I ſincerely believe they wrong him: And as I am well aſſur'd, that ſome (plauſible) Error of his Judgment led him into what he now profeſſes; ſo I am not without hopes, that a due Apprehenſion of his Miſtake, will yet reſtore him to that State in which he was before his *diſorderly Imaginations* grew upon him; for I am perſwaded, that if he ever receives a Conviction, he will fairly acknowledge it.

That I ſhould charge him with *renouncing* the *common Obligations* to a *Religious Courſe of Life*, I would not have ſuppoſed: But whereas the very *Rite* it ſelf whereby the *Covenant of Baptiſm* is applied to Mankind, was Specified and Enjoin'd by our *Bleſſed Lord*, (as I have ſhewn in the foregoing Papers) I muſt needs declare, That whoever does reject the Method above-mention'd, is ſo far chargeable with *renouncing* ſuch a *Baptiſm* as *Chriſt* enjoins. How far that is my Friend's Caſe, I leave to himſelf and the Great *Searcher of Hearts*; To whom I earneſtly and ſincerely pray, that He would be pleas'd,

of

of his infinite Goodneſs, to give him a lively Senſe of the Miſtake he lies under, (if it be one;) and (if not,) that He would graciouſly vouchſafe the like Mercy to me, who, as yet, cannot help believing it a moſt deplorable *Deluſion!*

This brief Declaration will (I hope) do me Right in the Opinion of my Friend; and, at the ſame time, convince him, that I wiſh his Temporal and Eternal Happineſs, no leſs than that of,

Pont y pool,
July 2*d.*
1708.

Tho. Andrewes.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

HAving in the foregoing Papers conſider'd the Validity of *Theodor Eccleſton*'s Arguments, I come now to enquire whether his Relations of Fact are honeſtly ſet forth; and am perſuaded I ſhall (with ſmall difficulty) convince every unprejudic'd Reader, that in this part of his Performance he has ſhewn no more regard to *Truth*, than he has to *Reaſon* and *Holy Scripture* in the other.

He (or ſomebody for him) has been pleaſed to ſay (*Pref.* p. 2.) "*That if any Errors* "*have been endeavoured to be fixed upon them* (the Quakers) "*they are owing to our Mi-* "*ſtake, Perverſion, Malice, or Miſrepreſentation,* "*and not to their Principles.*" This, together with the *Calumny* and *Slander* I am afterwards accus'd of, will give the unacquainted Reader a very notable Idea of the *Expoſtulator*; and cannot be thought to inſinuate leſs than that I had laid Errors of my own invention to their charge, quoted their Authors for what they never ſaid, and impeach'd them for Miſ-behaviours whereof the Good Men were wholly innocent.

It concerns me therefore to obviate theſe very hard Suggeſtions, *Firſt*, by aſſuring the Reader, that I have taken the Principles of Quakeriſm entirely from their own Authors, and thoſe of note, and cited them ſo very juſtly, that even Mr. *Eccleſton* himſelf (who would

would hardly have favour'd me in that reſpect) does not lay one Miſ-quotation to my account: And Next, by producing ſuch authentick Teſtimonies of the Tranſactions I referr'd to, as cannot but induce every honeſt Man to believe otherwiſe concerning me, than my unfair Antagoniſt ſeems inclinable he ſhould.

The firſt Injuſtice I am ſaid to have done them, is, that I call'd their *unlawful Aſſembly in the Streets*, to inveigh againſt the Eſtabliſh'd Church, *a riotous Liberty*. The Term (indeed) belongs to the Gentlemen of the Law; amongſt whom there is one of no ſmall note, who tells me I was not miſtaken in the Phraſe: However, if there muſt be *Arms* in the caſe, 'tis but to pray in aid of the Pſalmiſt, who tells us (*Pſal.* 64. 3.) that *there is a Generation who* (tho' perhaps they uſe no Guns nor Piſtols, yet) *ſhoot out their Arrows, even bitter Words.*

What follows is a Contradiction of Matters of Fact, in anſwer to which I have hereunto added the Oaths and ſolemn Affirmations of ſome Perſons, who were inſtant and careful Obſervers of the ſeveral Tranſactions. Theſe you will find in the Groſs, as they were taken by *Chriſtopher Price* Eſq; one of Her Majeſty's Juſtices of the Peace for this County of *Monmouth*, in the Preſence of *John Hanbury* Eſq; and *Others*, in due Form. Tho' for your readier Information I have here ſet them againſt the ſeveral Aſſertions they appear to contradict.

Pref. p. 6.

The ſaid Barbara *at that time labour'd under ſome Trouble of Mind for want of comfortable Aſſurance of her future Welfare.*

Affidavit of John James.

John James (Husband of the ſaid *Barbara*) maketh Oath, That the Diſcompoſure of his Wife did proceed from a bodily Diſtemper, and want of ſix or ſeven Nights Sleep, and that when her Fits were off, ſhe was very calm and eaſy in Mind.

NOTE.

This Miſrepreſentation of her Illneſs was to wipe off the Abſurdity (to give it no worſe Name) of preaching to a Perſon delirous, and terrifying one in ſo weak a Condition with a frightful Repreſentation of the Religion ſhe profeſs'd; and likewiſe to make way for that (otherwiſe groſsly miſapply'd) Scripture, *they that are whole need not the Phyſician*, &c. which every body knows was not ſpoken of Perſons who *wanted Opiates to procure their natural Reſt.*

Pref. p. 6.

Leſt (Hannah Evans) *a Siſter of the ſaid* Barbara *ſhould be ſurpriz'd at the coming of our Friends, that very Siſter was acquainted before-hand, that ſome of them deſign'd a friendly Viſit*

Declaration of H. Evans.

Hannah Evans (Siſter of the ſaid *Barbara*) ſolemnly declareth, that Leave was (indeed) ask'd of her for *two Young-Women-Quakers* to come and ſee her Siſter; but that ſhe did not

to the Perſon in Affliction.

not know of any *Men* that were to come with them, till ſhe ſaw them in the Houſe.

NOTE.

I doubt not but the impartial Reader ſees how artfully my Charge is evaded in this *Reply*, and is ready to object, that the Permiſſion (not Invitation) of *two Young Women* to See her Siſter, could no way prevent her Surprize at the unexpected coming of *ſeveral Men* to Declare or Preach to her.

Pref. p. 8.

To the ſaid Barbara *(according to her own Deſire) the Quakers declared the Mercy and Goodneſs of the Lord here.*

Declaration of B. James.

The ſaid *Barbara* ſolemnly affirmeth that ſhe never did deſire *Roger Jenkins*, or any other Quaker to declare or preach to her during her Illneſs this time two year, or at any other time.

NOTE.

This is ſo direct and full a Contradiction of the Truth, that it cannot be eſteem'd the Dictate of that Good Spirit, to whom *lying Lips are an Abomination.*

Pref. p. 7.

Roger Jenkins *is perſuaded, that he was not guilty*

Affidavit of J. James.

John James maketh Oath, That (ſome time ſince

of what he is here charg'd with, and one of the Auditors then preſent has affirmed to ſome of us, that the Expreſſions of the ſaid Jenkins *were not* [that ſuch as receiv'd Tythes were in the power of the Devil;] *nor yet in Words to that effect. But the ſaid* Roger *does mind that he us'd an Expreſſion in the Epiſtle to the* Hebrews, *that the Prieſthood being changed, there is made of neceſſity a Change alſo in the Law,* &c.

ſince) going to viſit *Roger Jenkins* (then a Priſoner in *Monmouth*-Jail, for non-payment of Tythes in his own Pariſh) he (the ſaid *Roger*) fell into an Argument againſt Tythes from the ſame place in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*; and concluded, that ſuch as adher'd to the Receipt of Tythes did deny Chriſt.

NOTE.

I might multiply Examples of *Roger*'s Invectives againſt Tythes, which he always ſums up in the very ſame Concluſion; but I ſuppoſe the Friends will hardly diſpute that piece of Hiſtory; and then I believe no Man in his Senſes, will ſcruple to acknowledge, that to *deny Chriſt*, and be *in the Power of the Devil* are *Words to the ſame effect.*

Pref. *ibid.*

Some then preſent do ſay, that the Quakers left the ſaid Barbara *in a very quiet frame of Mind.*

Declaration of H. Evans.

Hannah Evans aforeſaid, ſolemnly declareth, that tho' her Siſter was in a very quiet frame of mind when Mr. *Andrewes*, Miniſter of the Pariſh pray'd with

with her on the *Sunday*-Morning; yet, that when her Husband came from *Bergavenny*, and Mr. *Andrewes* from *Lanover* in the Evening, ſhe was in a raving Condition, and adds, that ſome of the Quakers were ſtill in the Room when Mr. *Andrewes* came into the Houſe.

Pref. *ibid.*

The ſaid Barbara *her ſelf, being ſince reſtored to a more ſedate Temperament of Spirit, has often declar'd to* Iſaac Morgan *(upon his repeated Queries to her, occaſion'd by our Expoſtulator's Slander herein) that ſhe was not diſcompos'd for what ſhe heard in that* Meeting.

John James maketh Oath, That a Paper being brought by *Joſeph John* for his Wife to ſign, importing, that the Quakers Preaching or Diſcourſing to her was no occaſion of her Diſcompoſure; ſhe refus'd to do it, alledging (amongſt other Reaſons) that her Diſorder made her uncapable of remembring. And the ſaid *Barbara* herſelf declareth that ſhe was loth to ſign it, leſt it ſhould afterwards trouble her.

NOTE.

Next to preaching to a Woman in her Condition, it was a notable Flight of Juſtice and Prudence to deſire ſhe ſhould account for what happen'd to her in a Delirium. But the Behaviour was all of a piece, and I believe

believe will fairly entitle the Agents to St. *Paul's* Character (2 *Tim.* 3. 6.) of *Men who creep into Houſes*, &c. tho' (God be prais'd) the Woman was neither ſo *ſilly* nor ſo *ſinful*, as to be *led away captive* by their Deluſions.

And this may ſuffice to convince the unprejudic'd that there was no juſt Cauſe to ſuſpect my Accuſation of them; notwithſtanding I was miſinform'd as to *Iſaac Morgan's* ſhare in it, and beg his Pardon for believing ſo ill of him; tho' *Iſaac* was there amongſt the reſt, and the Preaching-fact was true of another, whom they call *Ellis Owen*.

As to the Calumny mentioned (*p.* 8.) which the Parties ſuſpected do deny, I am ready, if the Friends will join iſſue upon it, to name the Names, and to produce my Vouchers, and ſhall be glad to find 'em innocent; tho' their Abuſe of Truth in the following Narrative, gives me no great ground to hope it.

Pref. *p.* 9.

But for the Demeanour of the ſaid Chriſtopher *and other* Quakers, *we ſuppoſe little can be objected in our Expoſtulator's own account, beſides their being covered; and in that they could not diſſemble, leſt thereby they ſhould countenance a way of Worſhip contrary to their Perſuaſion.*

Affidavit of W. Shatford.

William Shatford maketh Oath, That *Philip Maſhman*, one of the ſaid Quakers, ſtood over-againſt the Pulpit in an irreverent manner, making ſeveral Antick Poſtures.

Declaration of E. Beadleſs.

Eliſha Beadleſs (even the ſame *Eliſha* who is a Witneſs

neſs to this Narrative) declares under his Hand (in the Margin of *Eccleſton*'s Book) that the Behaviour of *Phil. Maſhman* has been diſallow'd, and he reproved for it.

NOTE.

I preſume the Reader will unavoidably fall upon the following Remarks, or ſome of like nature, at ſight of this Article. *Firſt*, That the *Expoſtulator* was far from aggravating the Behaviour of his Neighbours, in that he forbore drawing the Picture of this *Jack-pudding-Quaker*, who with his Belly thruſt out, his Face diſtorted, Hat cock'd, and Arms a kembow, and other Monkey-Tricks, endeavour'd to diſtract him from the Buſineſs he was upon: And next, That *Eliſha Beadleſs* has by no means done the Part of an *Honeſt Repreſenter*, in that he did not rather enter this Note in the Body of the *Preface* (which was to travel the Kingdom) than only write it upon the Books that were diſpers'd in this place, where every body could detect the Falſtood; or if he did do it, then that the Publiſher *(Eccleſton)* has been guilty of an unparallell'd Diſhoneſty in omitting it; tho' that indeed would have ſpoil'd the Currency of the glib Aſſertion above-cited; for I preſume, their Friend *Maſhman* was *reproved* for ſomething more than *not diſſembling*.

Pref. p. 9.

That Friend Chr. Meidel *made this Application, we have cauſe to ſuſpect, ſince our* Expoſtulator *has ſo much, before, abus'd us in his* Narrative; *and ſome, there preſent, do not remember it, but have given a better Account of him and his Teſtimony; and that he ſignified, That when the Ungodly turn to the Lord, they find the Enjoyment of Peace,* &c.

Affidavit of T. Birch.

Thomas Birch maketh Oath, That when Mr. *Andrewes* was pronouncing the Bleſſing after Sermon, the ſaid *Chriſtopher*, audibly, pronounc'd theſe Words —— *There is no Peace to the Wicked, ſaith my God; and ſuch* (or, *as*) *ye are all.*

Affidavit of W. Shatford.

William Shatford maketh Oath, That *Chr. Meidel* did utter the Words as above, only is not poſitive whether he ſaid, *as ye are all*, or, *as we are all.*

NOTE.

Thus (*Reader*) I have obviated every one of their Aſſertions, either from their own Conceſſions, or from the clear and authentick Teſtimony of Perſons well acquainted with the Matter, and, moſtly, ſuch as they themſelves referr to; and will leave the World to judge, whether I *have not Cauſe* to forewarn them of the Fate attending thoſe who *make Lyes their Refuge, and hide themſelves under a Covering of Falſhood*, Iſaiah 28. 15.

This

This *Narrative* is ſhut up with a taunting Inſinuation, That I ſhould call, *A ſhort Exhortation againſt Sin, inſulting the Conſtitution.* But ſure the *Prefacer* muſt needs know, that the Diſturbance of that Religious Worſhip, which is (I hope) an Eſſential Part of the *Conſtitution*, was the *Inſult* by me intended, and I am aſſur'd, had I been inclin'd to Diſtreſs them for it, the Laws of the *Conſtitution* would have explain'd it my Way. But I have learnt Religion from that *Good Maſter* who *loveth Mercy more than Sacrifice.*

Note, That in theſe Remarks upon the *Prefacers*, I do chiefly intend thoſe who were Perſonally acquainted with the Facts, and muſt therefore know their Allegations to be falſe: As to others, I can only pity their too-good-natur'd Credulity, and wiſh this Example of it may be a Means to open their Eyes!

DEPOSITIONS taken this 9th Day of *September*, *Anno Regni Annæ Reginæ nunc Magnæ Britanniæ*, &c. *ſeptimo*, *Annoq; Dom.* 1708.

Monmouth ſſ. JOhn *James* of the Pariſh of *Llanover* in this County, being voluntarily, and by his own Conſent, Sworn, Depoſeth and ſaith, That when Mrs. *Barbara James* (Wife of this Deponent) was taken, about two Years ago, with a Fit of Sickneſs, her Diſcompoſure did proceed from Bodily Diſtemper, and want of Sleep, ſhe having not ſlept or taken Natural Reſt for ſix or ſeven Nights together; and that this Deponent thereupon apply'd himſelf to Dr. *Roberts* for Plaiſters, Opiates, and other Remedies to remove it; and that Dr. *Roberts* did enquire whether the *Quakers* had not been with her? and alſo caution'd this Deponent that they might not come at her, as what would contribute to her Diſtraction, (or Words to that Effect;) the ſaid Doctor adding, That he was told, one of Mr. *Handly*'s Daughters had been in the ſame Condition. This Deponent further Depoſeth, That he never asked *Roger Jenkins*, or any other *Quaker*, to come and preach to his Wife; neither did he know or ever hear that his Wife made Application to *Roger Jenkins*, or any other *Quaker*, on that Account. He alſo further Depoſeth, That one

Joſeph

Joſeph John brought a Paper to this Deponent's Wife to Sign, importing, That the *Quakers* Preaching or Diſcourſing with her, was no Occaſion of her Diſcompoſure of Mind: Which ſhe refus'd to do, making Anſwer, That ſhe could not charge her Memory with Matters of that Conſequence, her Diſtemper incapacitating her for ſo doing. He alſo further ſaith, That his Wife (when her Fits were off) was very calm and eaſy in Mind, and did often blame her ſelf for entertaining thoſe *fooliſh Fancies* (as ſhe call'd them) that made her uneaſie. This Deponent further ſaith, That *Roger Jenkins* being a Priſoner in *Monmouth* Jail, for Non-payment of Tythes, this Deponent went to viſit him, and accidentally falling into a Diſcourſe about Tythes, the ſaid *Roger Jenkins* uttered theſe Words, or Words to the Effect following, That theſe (meaning Tythes) being part of the Law, and aboliſh'd, whoever adher'd to them, did deny Chriſt; to which effect he quoted a Text in the Author to the *Hebrews*. This Deponent further ſaith, That he receiv'd a Paper, ſign'd by his Wife, the Contents of which Paper ſhe own'd, and declar'd to be the Truth, (ſhe being, at preſent, not in a Condition to appear Abroad, being lately Brought-to-Bed;) the Contents of the ſaid Paper are to the Effect and in the Words following:

"I do ſolemnly declare and affirm, That "I never did (to the beſt of my knowledge) deſire *Roger Jenkins*, or any other *Quaker*, to Preach or Declare to me, during

" my Illneſs this time two Year, or at any " other time. I do likewiſe declare, That " my Anſwer to *Joſeph John*, when he " offer'd a Paper to me to be ſign'd, was, " That I was loth ſo to do, leſt it ſhould " trouble me afterwards; and it came like- " wiſe to my thought, that ſeeing Mr. *An-* " *drews* deſir'd no ſuch thing when he wrote " his Book, why ſhould I ſubſcribe to any " Part of theirs?

Witneſs my Hand, (Sept. 8. 1708.)

B. James.

This Deponent alſo depoſeth, That ſhe (this Deponent's Wife) ſent this Paper by him, as a Teſtimony of the Truth of what ſhe Sign'd and ſet her Hand to. And further this Deponent ſaith not.

Sign'd,

Capt. & Jurat. coram me, die & anno ſupradicto,

John James.

Chr. Price.

Monmouth ſſ. HAnnah *Evans* (Siſter of the ſaid *Barbara*) of the Pariſh of *Trevethin* in this County, (being unwilling to take an Oath, as having never taken one) ſolemnly declareth and affirmeth, That Leave was ask'd of her, for two young *Women-Quakers* to come and ſee her Siſter; but that ſhe did not know of any Men that were to come with them, till ſhe ſaw them in the Houſe. She further declareth, That her

her Sister was in a very Quiet Temper when Mr. *Andrewes* (Minister of the Parish) read Prayers to her on the *Sunday* Morning; but that when Mr. *James* (the Sick Woman's Husband) came from *Bergavenny*, and Mr. *Andrewes* from *Llanover*, she was in a Raving Condition, and forc'd to be used Roughly by her Mother: And she also saith, some of the *Quakers* were still in the Room when Mr. *Andrewes* came thither. And further declareth not.

Capt. eodem die & anno coram me,

The Mark — Z — of
Hannah Evans.

Chr. Price.

Monmouth ss. THomas *Birch* of *Trevethin* aforesaid, being also voluntarily Sworn, Deposeth, That about a Year and half ago, one *Christopher Meidel*, with some other *Quakers*, came irreverently to the Parish-Church of the said Parish of *Trevethin*, having their Hats on their Heads, at the time of Divine-Service, where they continued 'till Service and Sermon were over. And this Deponent saith, That upon Mr. *Andrewes*'s pronouncing the Blessing after Sermon, the said *Christopher*, audibly, pronounc'd these Words — *There is no Peace to the Wicked, saith my God; and such* (or, *as*) *you are all.* And further this Deponent saith not.

Jur. & Cap. coram me, eod. die & anno,

Sign'd,
Tho. Birch.

Chr. Price.

Mon-

Monmouth ff. *William Shattford* of the ſame Pariſh and County, being Sworn, as in the former Depoſitions mention'd, ſaith, That he remembers moſt Part of what is contain'd in the former Depoſition, with this Addition, That one *Philip Maſhman* a *Quaker* came into the Church, and ſtood over-againſt the Pulpit, during Sermon-time, in an irreverent manner, making ſeveral Antick Poſtures: And that *Chr. Meidel* did utter the Words as in the other Depoſition, only with this difference, that this Deponent cannot diſtinctly remember whether he ſaid, *which Ye*, or *which We are all.*

Sign'd,

Jur. & Cap. (ut ſupra)
coram me,
Chr. Price.

Will. Shattford.

FINIS.